



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/107,618	06/30/1998	STEVEN M BLUMENAU	E0295/7066RF	8313

7590

05/02/2003

WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2211

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003

28

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/107,618

Applicant(s)

BLUMENAU ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2153

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to Applicant preliminary amendment filed 2/24/03. The prior office action (paper 26) is withdrawn because the action was mailed prior to receiving the preliminary amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericson US patent 6,061,753. ~~As~~ and further in view of Yu US patent 4,919,545.

As per claim 1, 5-8, and 12, Ericson teaches a data management method for managing access to a storage system between two devices coupled to the storage system through a network [col.1 "SCSI Fibre Channel bus or Ethernet based local area network"], the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2153

Receiving over the network at the storage system a request from one of the device [initiator - see col.3 lines 56-60];

Selectively servicing, at the storage system, the request responsive to configuration data indicating that the device [initiator] is authorized to access the portion of data [col.4 lines 4-25].

Ericson does not teach authenticating the request at the storage system to authenticate the device issuing the request. Yu teaches a security method for authorizing access by a process in source node to a resource in the network comprising encrypting an identifier of the requesting node using a key associated with the node, sending the encrypted key to the resource, decrypting the identifier at the resource node to verify the request [see abstract]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Yu with the storage system of Ericson because it would have enable secure access to the storage system over a network.

As per claim 2, Ericson teaches the storage system stores a plurality of volumes of data where configuration data stored in the storage system in a configuration table [look-up table] having identifier and information indicating which volumes are available to a device [col.4 lines 34-54].

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 3, it is apparent that the request would be forwarded to the storage system over the network.

As per claim 4, Ericson teaches using Fibre Channel [col.1 line 15, col.6 line 5]. It is apparent that a system with Fibre Channel would use Fibre Channel protocol.

As per claims 15-18, 21-22, 26-29 they are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 1-8 above.

As per claims 11 and 30, Ericson teaches plural disk drives [RAID col.4 lines 5-15].

As per claims 13 and 19-20, 24-25, Ericson teaches row with bitmap records corresponding to teach device authorized to access each of the corresponding ports [col.4 lines 40-53].

As per claims 14 and 23, Ericson teaches precluding service request responsive to configuration data [col.4 lines 47-50].

As per claim 9, 10, 31, 32, Ericson does not specifically disclose that the device is a host processor or file server. The type of device making the request would clearly have been a matter of design choice because it does not change the functionality of the storage system access control method taught by Ericson. Furthermore, Ericson teaches using the system may be used over a local area network [col.1 lines 15-16]. It is apparent in such a usage to have host processor or file server requesting access to the storage system.

Art Unit: 2153

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 2100 Customer Service whose telephone number is (703) 306-5631.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)
(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
April 30, 2003